



INTRODUCTION

Sheila Jelen and Shachar Pinsker

All the writings in the Holy Tongue that I have had the opportunity to read by a woman's hand were far superior in style and linguistic clarity than the writings by the hands of men. A woman writes with a feather quill; a man with a stylus of metal and lead. A woman writes in a simple style that guilelessly follows the language's spirit, with none of those excessive rhetorical flourishes that jar on the refined soul, of the likes of which it is said, "with neither adornments nor cosmetics." Not so with the men, many of whom prefer to multiply their words like sand and to sound tinkle bells causing the reader's ears to cringe. The reason for this in my opinion is that the brains of girls have not been corrupted in youth in the lethal rooms of the *heder* and their honest minds have not been distorted by sermons and sophistries, so that their taste has survived and their scent has not gone awry.

Y. L. Gordon, 1881¹

i.

Y. L. Gordon (Yalag, 1860–1927) posits, here, women's ignorance of traditional Hebrew culture as the key to their success in Hebrew literature. In so doing, he unwittingly lays the groundwork for Dvora Baron's paradoxical debut into the world of Hebrew letters just over two decades later. Indeed, Baron's emergence as a Hebrew writer at the turn of the twentieth century in Eastern Europe was as much a form of resistance to Yalag's naïve assertion of faith in Jewish women's ability to become Hebrew writers *ex nihilo*, as it was an affirmation of his purported validation of woman writers of Hebrew.

Scholars of Modern Hebrew literature, from the beginning of Baron's literary career to the present day, have grappled with Baron's simultaneously conventional and subversive literary corpus. Her singularity as the only canonic woman writer of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance must necessarily be read against the backdrop of her work having been written in constant dialogue with a male tradition of scholarship and erudition. Baron, unlike Yalag's assertion, *did* write like the men of her period; if she had not, she could not have published at all. Hebrew was not a living, spoken language at the beginning of Baron's career,

and her only recourse for textual models and rhetorical paradigms was the literature of Jewish religious life and the modern Hebrew literature of the Haskalah, the Jewish Enlightenment, produced during the nineteenth century. At the same time, she *did not* write like them. Her thematics, her patterns of intertextuality, her narrative voices, and her treatment of popular expectations were different from those of her colleagues. The intersection of Baron's conventionality and subversiveness, and the critical history of her reception as it confronted these ostensibly opposing forces are the foci of this anthology.

Dvora Baron (1887–1956) was born in Ouzda, a small town in the Russian pale of Jewish settlement. Her father, Rabbi Shabtai Eliezer—the town's rabbi—raised her in a rather unusual way for a young Jewish girl at that time. He allowed her to study the Bible, Talmud, Midrash, and other texts of the traditional *yeshiva* curriculum. Baron began publishing stories in the Hebrew and Yiddish press at the age of fifteen (1902), just before she left home to acquire a secular education; this was the beginning of a prolific literary career. Although Baron tried as early as 1908 to have her work published in book form, she did not successfully do so until 1927 with the publication of her first collection: *Stories (Sipurim)*. Baron's renowned Hebrew translation of Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* appeared in 1932; in fact, until 1991, Baron's was the only unabridged translation of the novel available in Hebrew.² In 1934, Baron won the prestigious Bialik Prize for her volume of short stories *Trifles (Ketanot)*, 1933.³ She won a second prestigious Hebrew literary award, the Rupin prize, for her novella *For the Time Being (le-'Et 'Ata)*, 1943), which treated the subject of the exile of foreign nationals from the Jewish settlements in Palestine during World War I.⁴ Baron's most comprehensive collection of stories, entitled *Parshiyot [Tales]*, 1951) received broad recognition and multiple honors, including the Brenner Hebrew literary prize.⁵ Additional collections of Baron's work published in Hebrew during her lifetime and posthumously include: *What Has Been (Mah she-Hayah)*, 1939), *From There (mi-Sham)*, 1946), *The Bricklayer (ha-Laban)*, 1947), *Sunbeams (Shavririm)*, 1949), *Links (Huliyot)*, 1952), *From Yesterday (me-Emesh)*, 1956), *Collected Stories (Yalkut Sipurim)*, 1969), and *The Exiles (ha-Golim)*, 1970).⁶ Baron's literary oeuvre consists of some eighty short stories and a few longer novellas written over a period of fifty-four years.

Baron's literary career has been divided into two periods by her biographer, Nurit Govrin. The first half (1902–1923), documented in this volume by Govrin's survey of the stories written during that period, was an eventful time in Baron's life—a time full of professional transitions and geographic dislocations. After spending some years in major Jewish cities in the Pale of Settlement (including Kovno, Mariampol, Minsk, and Vilna), she immigrated to Palestine in December 1910, having already made something of a name for herself. In Palestine, she met and married Joseph Aharonovich, who was a Zionist activist and the

editor of the important journal of Labor Zionism, *ha-Poel ha-Tza'ir* [The young laborer]. Baron became the editor of the literary supplement of this prominent publication, and continued to publish stories in the Hebrew press. In 1914, Dvora Baron, her husband, and their baby daughter Tzipora were exiled to Egypt by the Ottoman authorities. They returned to Palestine only after the end of World War I, in 1919. Throughout this period, she published her early stories in the Hebrew and Yiddish press but later renounced them, refusing to collect and republish them. During the "second half" of Baron's career (1923–1956), as conceived by Govrin, Baron confined herself to her apartment in Tel Aviv. It was during her thirty-three-year seclusion that she wrote and collected most of the stories and novellas published in her definitive collection *Parshiyot*. Baron died in Tel Aviv in 1956.

ii.

Critical reception of Baron's fiction is complex and fraught with contradictions. On the one hand, her work received positive, even enthusiastic, responses from the time she was a girl of fifteen. The publication of her work in Hebrew journals such as *ha-Melitz* [The advocate] and *ha-Tzfira* [The siren]⁷ caused an immediate sensation not just because of the author's tender age but also because of her gender. The very existence of a woman writing Hebrew fiction at that time was an anomaly; until then, Hebrew fiction was almost entirely the exclusive domain of male writers, most of them former *yeshiva* students. Furthermore, Baron's identity as a Hebrew writer after the close of the Haskalah in the 1880s was viewed as exemplary and galvanizing. The fact that a young woman had chosen to write in Hebrew when the vast majority of privileged Jewish men had given up on the possibility of a national (or linguistic) revival served as a much needed reminder that the desire to transform Jewish life still existed. Many people regarded the new phenomenon of a Hebrew woman-writer as an important achievement because it was seen as evidence that women could also participate in the Hebrew national and cultural revival; Baron's literary debut was a sign of normalization and equality.⁸

In this context, we can easily understand the often hyperbolic admiration of the young Dvora Baron. Many editors solicited stories from her. The older writers saw in her a "daughter," and the younger saw her as a "sister of the pen."⁹ At the same time, these tokens of admiration point to the main problem with the way Baron was read and understood until quite recently. In spite of the enthusiasm about the appearance of Baron in the literary and cultural Hebrew scene, there was not much serious engagement with her fiction. For many decades there was a significant gap between the favorable reception of Baron as a Hebrew woman writer and the reluctance to confront and fully grasp the meaning of her stories

and novellas. Critics were much more interested in Dvora Baron as a social and cultural phenomenon than in her stories and their poetic significance.

In this light, it is not very surprising that so much of the early critical writing on Baron is pseudo-psychological. During the 1920s and 1930s, critics such as Dov Kimchi, Y. Lichtenbaum, Ya'akov Fichman, and Pinchas Lachover viewed Baron as a documenter of "slices of life," or memories of her girlhood in the *shtetl*, rather than as a writer who deliberately uses these materials to shape a sophisticated literary oeuvre.¹⁰ In 1974, Ada Pagis edited the only collection of critical essays devoted to Baron's fiction to date. In this work, Pagis highlights the fact that most critics and readers during Baron's lifetime wrote about her in an impressionistic way. Despite that, important Hebrew poets and writers such as Leah Goldberg, Rachel Katznelson-Shazar, and Yeshurun Keshet movingly portray Baron's fiction. Rachel Katznelson-Shazar finds in Baron's stories a mirror to a vanishing world that she (and many in her generation) knew very well, but chose to repress. Yeshurun Keshet writes in a remarkable poetic style about Baron's engagement with the Eastern European *shtetl*, and highlights Baron's special ties with the Bible and biblical materials. Leah Goldberg describes in broad strokes some of the main themes of Baron's stories and the uniqueness of Baron's narrator against the literary conventions of her generation.¹¹

A major change in the way critics and the audience read and understood Baron took place at the end of the 1950s, after Baron's death and the publication of *Parshiyot*. Important critics such as Dan Miron and Eliezer Schweid rebuffed the claim that Baron's writing is autobiographical and documentary. Instead, they emphasized the mythic qualities of Baron's fiction and viewed her as a writer whose focus was on a cyclical, ahistorical world of fundamental unity and internal wholeness.¹² In his influential essay (included in this volume), Miron argues that Baron's preoccupation with the Lithuanian *shtetl* and with the history and culture of Eastern European Jewry reflects, in fact, an engagement with a universal humanity and not the landscape and culture she ostensibly depicts. Of the temporally and geographically specific details in Baron's stories, he asserts: "She does not see them as expressions of a characteristic historical-cultural way of life distinct from other ways of life....Her attention is not focused on culture and history but rather on the life cycle, with runs through the biological recurrence of birth, parenthood, old age, illness, and death."¹³ According to Miron, the author uses the mythification of reality to strip her stories of specific time and place, with the purpose of translating historical and social experience into a static microcosm. This enabled Baron to shape a form of experience that did not demand the active intervention of an authorial or narrative figure. In this view, Baron's use of an intertextual, "midrashic" technique is connected to her desire to fashion an ahistorical world; textual parallels are her principal way of creating a sense that each

character and action in the present has a counterpart in the past, but no stake in the future.¹⁴

This view, which eventually became the predominant Israeli critical position on Baron, highlights some important features of her work. Still, it is problematic because it shunts Baron off into a historical limbo that does not allow her to belong to any period or literary movement. On the one hand, Miron claims, Baron cannot be considered one of the classic writers of *shtetl* stories, because she does not write according to the formula and worldview established by S. J. Abramowitz (Mendele Mokher Sefarim, 1835–1917) and his generation.¹⁵ On the other hand, she cannot be counted among the Hebrew modernists of the early twentieth century because, in Miron's words, Baron "passed almost entirely over ...the Jewish individual, the young Hebrew...of her generation in his isolation, intellectualism, and introspection."¹⁶ In his statement, Miron succinctly marks the normative narrative of the national male subject in Hebrew literature of that period. This is, indeed, the very subject that Baron generally has no interest in presenting.¹⁷ Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to say that she ignored this model. After all, it stood before her constantly. She confronted this model, used it for her own needs, and struggled to create an alternative subject.

Similar confusion about Baron's poetic classification and historical placement in the modernist Hebrew literary canon can be found in the criticism of Gershon Shaked, who writes: "The Lithuanian *shtetl* provides the material for the great majority of her stories. She is not a model writer of the Second *Aliya*. In practice, she is a writer of limited worlds. Her elegiac and ideal tones have their source in her fondness for 'what was and is no more.'" Therefore, Shaked continues, "she may be one of those writers at the side of the road, who do not leave an impression on heirs and successors."¹⁸

Over the last two decades, there has been some change in the way Baron is read and understood. Critics such as Nurit Govrin, Ada Pagis, and Lili Ratok have begun to read her work in the vein of Anglo-American "gyno-critics" with special attention to Baron's position as a woman and to the fact that most of the characters in her stories are women. This was accompanied by Govrin's important project of republishing Baron's early stories, which were never included in her books and were nearly forgotten.¹⁹ Govrin's analysis of these early stories (included in this volume) was instrumental to the way we understand Baron today.

Yet, surprisingly, critics such as Govrin, Ratok, and Pagis have essentially accepted the interpretive assumptions of the Hebrew literary critics of the 1960s and 1970s by creating a new dichotomy between Baron's early and later work. According to Govrin, Baron received patronizing reactions to her early stories. She subsequently internalized the tacit male dictate, and changed her style radi-

cally. She ceased to write stories that were “frank and remonstrative but artistically simplistic” and instead produced “sophisticated but conciliatory, mythological stories, subordinate to an ahistorical, cyclical view of the world.”²⁰

Lili Ratok argues that Baron’s decision to make stylistic changes, and also to make the Lithuanian *shtetl* the primary subject of her later stories (those written after her arrival in Palestine), was the result of her internalization of the patriarchal literary establishment’s standards. Ratok sets out three principal components of a model for understanding Baron’s work. First, instead of the Zionist community in Palestine or the modern European city, Baron “retreated” into the Lithuanian *shtetl*. Second, Baron refrained from dealing with the national and social problems of her day and, instead, focused on the world of the individual, especially women, within the framework of the family. Third, Baron repressed her anger and exchanged it for compassion, by mythologizing and by adopting the lyric-poetic style of her later period.²¹

Interestingly enough, the very same factors that caused critical ambivalence toward Baron’s fiction now emerge as crucial in the process of reevaluation and the renewed interest in Baron’s fiction in the last decade. This should be seen as part of a larger cultural shift. One obvious reason for this is the growing attention to questions of women’s writing and issues of gender in general and in Jewish women’s experience in particular. Another factor is the renewed interest in Eastern European Jewish culture, as well as in what can be called a “poetics of exile.” The reexamination of Baron and her fiction through these lenses facilitates a redefinition of Baron’s affiliation with Hebrew and European modernism and her relations with Jewish textual tradition.

iii.

The essays in this anthology highlight many aspects of Baron’s fiction that have dominated the critical reception of her work—past and present. Gender is the first of these. Until the late 1950s, with the appearance of writers such as Amalia Kahana-Carmon and Yehudit Hendel in Israel, Baron was not only the sole canonical female writer of Hebrew fiction, she was also one of the few writers who gave clear dominance to a female point of view and narrative voice.

In one way or another, all the essays in this anthology touch on this issue. Wendy Zierler’s essay on daughters in the fiction of Dvora Baron and Orly Lubin’s presentation of Baron’s “alternative nationalism” pick up on the long-standing critical concern with gender as an organizing principle of Baron’s oeuvre. In Zierler’s essay, we read a discussion of Baron’s depiction of “knowledge” obtained by “daughters” as opposed to “sons,” whereas in Lubin’s essay, we observe Baron’s conflicted attitude, as a woman, toward literary expressions of Zionist nationalism. Avraham Balaban discusses the story “Bill of Divorce”

and shows how simply publishing the story was an act of subversive, feminist, courage on Baron's part. He emphasizes the fact that in her "late stories" Baron fuses radical criticism with a restrained style that enables her to camouflage her critique of traditional Jewish life, and specifically the rabbinic oppression of women.

A second element of Baron's fiction that has been much discussed in the critical literature is the fact that the majority of her work depicts Eastern European Jewish society, represented in the literary image of the *shtetl*. This preference was not a common one for Hebrew writers during the first half of the twentieth century, a period of intense national and Zionist activity. It was especially surprising that a writer who lived and wrote in the very center of the local Hebrew culture in Palestine resisted representing the *Yishuv* and pioneer life in most of her literary work. Many other Hebrew writers in Baron's generation came from the same Eastern European background, but whereas many of them attempted to render a literary account of Jewish life in Palestine, Baron focused on the world of her childhood as her primary subject matter. Furthermore, in those instances in which Baron wrote about the move to Palestine, her representation was not much different from her literary depiction of the *shtetl*.

Orly Lubin and Shachar Pinsker focus on these elements. Each of them attempts to explain Baron's sustained engagement with the Eastern European Jewish world against the dominant national Hebrew ideology that was forming in Palestine around the time that Baron published the bulk of her canonic works. Naomi Seidman reminds us that many Modern Hebrew and Yiddish writers wrote about the *shtetl*, both in Palestine and in Europe, and she questions Baron's marginalization from that canon. In her placement of Baron's *shtetl* narratives into the context of the *shtetl* canon that emerged in Yiddish and Hebrew literature at the turn of the twentieth century, Seidman probes the difference of Baron's *shtetl* depictions as well as their similarities to the prevailing discourse.

The third narrative element of Baron's work that has been most frequently focused upon in the criticism is the intricate relationship between Baron's fiction and traditional Jewish texts. Like many of the male writers in this period, Baron weaves a complex biblical, talmudic, and midrashic intertextual web. However, she does it in a way that is different from most of her male contemporaries. Whereas many of her predecessors such as S. J. Abramowitz used biblical and rabbinic texts for rhetorical and satiric effect, Baron engaged these texts thematically. Others, such as Y. H. Brenner and M. Y. Berdichevsky gestured toward biblical and rabbinic intertexts primarily as that which they rejected culturally and rhetorically. Baron's use of midrashic language and technique has frequently been understood as a naïve relic of traditional folkways and traditional values. This critical assumption seems to reinforce the standard reading of Baron

as a traditionalist, non-modernist writer, but a number of essays in this collection question this postulation. Shachar Pinsker and Marc Bernstein both explore Baron's intertextual deployment of biblical and rabbinic literature in their essays here. Whereas Bernstein emphasizes Baron's resistance to traditional, allegorical readings of women's experience, Pinsker views traditional rabbinic and modern Zionist nationalist ideologies side-by-side through the lens of Baron's fiction.

The fourth major theme in criticism of Baron's work is Baron's place in the Hebrew literary canon and her affiliation and contacts with literary modernist trends of her time. Most critics and literary historians do not consider Baron to be part of the modernist stylistic revolution that occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century. Only in the last decade or so have critics begun to investigate seriously the unique style that Baron has fashioned, and showed that it is indeed different from other (male) Hebrew and Yiddish modernists but responds to very similar stylistic and linguistic concerns. Sheila Jelen's essay on Baron's relationship to the Hebrew literature of "the uprooted" deals explicitly with Baron's affiliation with—or deliberate disaffiliation from—the literature of Hebrew and European modernist trends. Bernstein, in his essay, probes Baron's relationship with her better-known friend and colleague S. Y. Agnon.

iv.

This anthology aims to represent the scope and diversity of the recent interest in Dvora Baron and her fiction. Bridging the criticism on Baron produced in Israel and the United States, from the 1950s to the present, it is a testament to Baron's consistent—and persistent—presence in the critical discourse of modern Jewish literary culture. Born out of a mutual fascination with Baron's simultaneous, and complementary, commitment to tradition and modernity, the idea for this book germinated when we were students together at the University of California, Berkeley, in a survey course on the development of Modern Hebrew prose style. Baron was not, we were taught through omission, a part of the generation of men who broke out of the traditional house of study to create a modern literary path toward Jewish nationalization and cultural rejuvenation. Rather, she was to be understood primarily as a stylistic anomaly, a blip in the trajectory of modern Hebrew literature. We were not alone, however, in our insistence on Baron's inclusion in what seemed to be already ossified canons. Chana Kronfeld and Naomi Seidman, throughout the period of our graduate education, translated, wrote about, and taught Dvora Baron. Together, they collaborated on *The First Day and Other Stories* (Berkeley, 2001) and *Conversations with Dvora: An Experimental Biography of the First Modern Hebrew Woman Writer* (Berkeley, 1997).

In both America and in Israel, we probed the broadly accepted critical wisdom on Baron—i.e., that her work was autobiographical, that her depictions

of the *shtetl* demonstrated resistance to the movements of modern Jewish history, that her relationship to traditional literature was anecdotal as opposed to rhetorically and thematically integral to her work. We included Baron in the literary histories we tried to rewrite in our dissertations—situating her alongside the realist and modernist giants of the Modern Hebrew literary revolution—Mendele and Bialik, Gnessin and Brenner.

At Berkeley, Harvard, Ben Gurion, the University of Michigan, and the University of Maryland, we have taught Baron in classes ranging from “A History of Modern Hebrew Literature,” “Women and Jewish Literature,” “Gender in the Modern Jewish Literary Imagination,” “Exile and Homecoming in Hebrew Literature,” and “Introduction to Critical Methods in the Study of Literature.” She has served as an invaluable source for ourselves, as well as for our students, in the study of difference, of intertextuality, of literary historiography, of narratology, and finally, of Modern Hebrew and Jewish literary canons and trends. Colleagues in a variety of disciplines, ranging from history to sociology, have approached us for information on Baron’s work because of her unusual identity as the only canonic woman writer of Hebrew in the first half of the twentieth century. We have found references to her in books on the Holocaust, in articles on women’s education in Eastern Europe, in discussions on the intersection of class and gender in the Jewish *shtetl*. We have facilitated countless discussions about the importance of reading modernism into texts that have long been regarded as autobiographical, of reading Talmud into texts that have long been regarded as biblical, of reading women into texts that have long been considered male. And all these discussions have centered around the life and work of Dvora Baron.

One thing that has been missing for us, particularly in the American institutions we have traveled through, learned in, and taught at, is a good selection of critical essays in English on Baron. Although several volumes of literary translations of Baron’s work exist (some still in print, some not),²² as interest in Baron increases exponentially, both in the popular Israeli imagination and in American academic institutions, it has become necessary to give our students access to critical voices on Baron, not strictly as filtered through our own readings and translations. We have long wanted to make available an exemplary selection of critical essays and accompanying literary translations to facilitate more informed discussions of Baron’s significance to the study of gender and Judaism, and the intersections of modern Jewish literature and traditional Jewish culture. The essays included here, ranging from Miron’s influential presentation of Baron’s mythopoetical approach to traditional Eastern European Jewish existence and Govrin’s ground-breaking survey of Baron’s early works, to Lubin’s revision of hegemonic Israeli nationalist literary narratives and Pinsker’s reading of Baron’s nationalist inclinations within the context of her intertextual allusions, are in dialogue with

one another—through time (from the 1950s to the present), through place (from Israel to the United States), and through discourses (nationalism and the *shtetl*, feminism and rabbinics). Many of the essays included here refer to one another, acknowledging where appropriate, and revising where necessary. Three translations of Baron's stories are also included here, two of which have never before been translated into English ("Transformations," and "For the Time Being") and one of which ("Agunah") has never before been translated in its earlier version from 1909.

Notes

1. Cited in Iris Parush, *Reading Jewish Women: Marginality and Modernization in Nineteenth-Century Eastern European Jewish Society* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2004), 238, n. 304.

2. Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary*, trans. Dvora Baron, vols. 1–2 (Berlin: Shtibel, 1932).

3. Dvora Baron, *Ketanot* [Trifles] (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Omanut, 1933).

4. Dvora Baron, *le-Et Atah* (For the time being) (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Am Oved, 1943).

5. Dvora Baron, *Parshiyot* [Tales] (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1951).

6. Dvora Baron, *Sipurim* [Stories] (Tel Aviv: Davar, 1927); *Mah she-Hayah* [What has been] (Tel Aviv: Davar, 1939); *mi-Sham* [From there] (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Am Oved, 1946); *ha-Laban* [The bricklayer] (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Am Oved, 1947); *Shavririm* [Sunbeams] (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Am Oved, 1949); *Huliyot* [Links] (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Am Oved, 1952); *me-Emesh* [Since last night] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1956); *Yalkut Sipurim* [Collected stories], ed. Rivka Gorfein (Tel Aviv: Yahdav, 1969); *ha-Golim* [The exiles] (Tel Aviv: Hotza'at Am Oved, 1970).

7. *Ha-Melitz* was a Hebrew journal published in Odessa and St. Petersburg between 1860 and 1904. *Ha-Tzifira* was a newspaper published between 1862 and 1931 in Warsaw and Berlin, first as a weekly and later as a daily.

8. *Dvora Baron: Mivhar Ma'amare Bikoret 'al Yetziratah* [Dvora Baron: A selection of critical essays on her work], ed. Ada Pagis (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1974), 8–9.

9. Nurit Govrin, *ha-Mahatzit ha-Rishonah: Dvora Baron, Hayehah vi-Yetziratah (1887–1923)* [The first half: Dvora Baron, her life and work (1887–1923)] (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1988), 94.

10. Dov Kimchi, "Dvora Baron—On Her Literary Image" (1922); Y. Lichtenbaum, "Dvora Baron" (1926); Ya'akov Fichman, "Dvora Baron's Stories" (1932); and Pinchas Lachover, "From There — A Woman Tells a Story" (1939), all in Pagis, *Dvora Baron*, op. cit.

11. Rachel Katznelson-Shazar, "Dvora Baron" (1946), in Pagis, 33–46; Yeshurun Keshet, "On Dvora Baron" (1951), in Pagis, 80–92; Leah Goldberg, "Parshiyot of Dvora Baron" (1951), in Pagis, 94–101.

12. Dan Miron, "The Endless Cycle: The World of Dvora Baron," in Pagis, 117–130; Eliezer Schweid, "The Riddle of Continuity" (in Hebrew) in Pagis, 109–116.

13. Miron, 119.

14. See also Schweid, 1978, 110.

15. The *nusakh* is the formulaic or synthetic style that is primarily associated with S. Y. Abramowitz (Mendele the book peddler). When Abramowitz translated his works from Yiddish to Hebrew and began to write Hebrew fiction in the 1880s, he formed a new style of Hebrew prose that was highly influential. While the literature of the Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment) relies on biblical strata as a predominant resource, Abramowitz's prose simultaneously employs different historical layers of Hebrew—but the dominant layer is rabbinic. About the *Nusach*, see Rober Alter, *The Invention of Hebrew Prose* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 31–32.

16. Miron, 127.

17. On the national male subject and his function in national narratives, see Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommers, Patricia Yaeger, *Nationalism and Sexualities* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992). On this subject in the context of Hebrew literature and culture, see, among others, Hanan Hever, *Producing the Modern Hebrew Canon: Nation Building and Minority Discourse* (New York: New York University Press, 2002); Yael Feldman, *No Room of Their Own: Israeli Women's Fiction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

18. Shaked, 1977, 453.

19. Govrin, 1988.

20. *Ibid.*, 11.

21. Lili Ratok, "Kol Isha Makira et Zeh" [Every woman knows it] (afterword), *ha-Kol ha-Aher* [The one voice] (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz Ha-Me'ukhad, 1994), 274.

22. We have tried to select essays that refer to previously translated stories by Baron. For example, Zierler refers to Baron's "The First Day" at the outset of her essay; Bernstein refers to "Agunah"; Jelen refers to "The End of Sender Ziv"; and Seidman refers to "Fedka"—all of which are available in *The First Day and Other Stories*, trans. Chana Kronfeld and Naomi Seidman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). Two of the stories included in this volume, "Transformations" and "For the Time Being," are translated here for the first time. Pinsker's essay refers to the former and Lubin's refers to the latter. Govrin's essay on Baron's early work should make evident the importance of reading Baron's early work alongside her later work, and even the same stories in different—earlier and later—versions.

The earliest collection of Dvora Baron's stories in English is *The Thorny Path and Other Stories*, trans. Joseph Schachter (Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1969). More recently published, *The First Day and Other Stories* presents a representative sample of stories from the "first" and "second" halves of Baron's literary career, authored both in Hebrew and in Yiddish. Also, stories by Baron have appeared in *The Ploughwoman: Records of the Pioneer Women of Palestine, A Critical Anthology*, eds. Mark Raider and Miriam Raider Roth (Hanover: Brandeis University Press, 2002); *The Oxford Book of Hebrew Short Stories*, ed. Glenda Abramson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); *Stories Form [sic] Women Writers of Israel* (New Delhi: Star Publications); and *Beautiful as the Moon, Radiant as the Stars: Jewish Women in Yiddish Stories, an Anthology*, ed. Sandra Bank (New York: Warner Books, 2003).

